



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,267	05/25/2007	Jane Elizabeth Ormond	2818.3460001	6590
26111	7590	10/02/2009	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.			RIGGLEMAN, JASON PAUL	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1792	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/02/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/579,267	ORMOND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JASON P. RIGGLEMAN	1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 May 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/2006.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Regarding claim 1, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hendrick-Collette (Belgium Patent No. 337440).

4. Hendrick-Collette teaches a device for cleaning a substrate such as a fabric, Figs. 7-8. The device has a reservoir for storing a cleaning fluid and a scrubbing member. The scrubbing member is in fluid communication with the reservoir. The scrubbing member has one or more dispensing orifices. There is a movable platform for forcing said cleaning fluid to exit from the reservoir to the scrubber member, where it is exposed on an exterior portion of the scrubber member via said dispensing orifices. The *scrubbing member* comprises a coarse mesh structure (coarse bristles). The platform has a wall or base portion of the reservoir and sliding the-platform within the reservoir, progressively compresses the cleaning composition which is thereby forced to exit the reservoir and flow to the scrubbing means. The reservoir is in fluid communication with the scrubbing means by way of an exit orifice or orifices. The reservoir is refillable with cleaning fluid or components thereof, by a user. The reservoir has a removable portion end cap.

The platform is configured for reciprocal generally axial movement within a generally tubular reservoir. The platform is movable by means of screw feed mechanism. The platform has a peripheral edge configured to slide in a sealing relationship with an inner surface of the reservoir, whereby sliding is guided by said inner surface.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Hendrick-Collette (Belgium Patent No. 337440). or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hendrick-Collette (Belgium Patent No. 337440).

6. Hendrick-Collette teaches a method of cleaning/polishing a fabric using a device in which there is a filled reservoir and then securing a removable portion e.g. end cap and scrubbing member on the device to close the reservoir. The platform is moved e.g by turning a screw-feed mechanism to force cleaning/polishing fluid from the reservoir to be exposed on the exterior of the scrubbing means; cleaning the fabric by scrubbing with said scabbing means.

7. In the alternative, Hendrick-Collette does not teach cleaning fabric and using soapy water solution; however, it has been held that an obvious choice in design (absent any showing of criticality) is not patentable (*In re Kuhle* 188 USPQ 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrick-Collette to utilize a conventional dispenser-type and liquid soap to clean fabric to achieve the expected result

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick-Collette (Belgium Patent No. 337440), as applied to claim 1, above.

11. Hendrick-Collette does not teach that the dispensing orifices are provided by a mesh fabric; however, it has been held that an obvious choice in design (absent any showing of criticality) is not patentable (*In re Kuhle* 188 USPQ 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hendrick-Collette to utilize a mesh fabric filter to filter out soap particulates and/or permit application of viscous liquids to clean fabric to achieve the expected result.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON P. RIGGLEMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-5935. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Barr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Jason P Riggleman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/J. P. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 1792